

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

The specification is amended to address a minor typographical error.

Claims 3-9, 13-18, and 20-26 remain pending.

Claims 3-9, 13-18, and 20-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are traversed.

Claims 3-9, 13-18, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. These rejections are traversed.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 13, 14, 17, 20, 21, 24, and 26 are amended. No new matter is added.

Claims 1, 2, 10-12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Bourret. Claims 1, 2, 10-12, and 19 are cancelled, thereby rendering the rejections moot. Claims 27-64 are also cancelled.

Claims 65-107 are added. No new matter is added.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for participating in a telephonic interview with the undersigned on May 14, 2008. Claims 1-26 were discussed.

Agreement was reached that the claim amendments herein overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections, for at least the reasons presented below.

Agreement was also reached that the new dependent claims 65-107 do not require further consideration because they recite features that are substantially identical to features recited in previously examined claims, as explained below.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show detailed elements of flowchart elements in Figures 12A-12B, as described in the specification at page 10, line 30, to page 11, line 31.

Applicants submit that the elements to which the Examiner refers (e.g., step 1255) are shown in FIGs. 12C-12D. It appears that the Examiner merely overlooked FIGs 12C-12D while

referring to the specification at page 10, line 30, to page 11, line 31. Thus, no amendments to the drawings are needed.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objection to the drawings should be removed.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification as making reference to background information or prior art at page 5. The section referred to does indeed reference prior art FIGs. 1 and 2, but Applicants can find no requirement that any and all references to acknowledged prior art be placed in a Background section. For example, the "preferred layout" language copied into the Office Action at page 4 explicitly states that "[t]hese guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use" (emphasis added). Thus, no amendments to the specification are needed.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objection to the specification should be removed.

Patentability of Claims 3-9, 13-18, and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 3-9, 13-18, and 20-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that independent claims 3, 7, and 8, as amended, each recite "a data structure storing a schema for a generic document" (emphasis added) and that independent claims 13, 17, 20, and 26, as amended, each recite "a data store storing a first generic document and storing a value for a first key value field" (emphasis added).

Furthermore, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to M.P.E.P. § 2101.06(I), which states that "a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory" (referring to *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1539, 1583-84, 32 USPQ.2d 1031, 1035).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of independent claims 3, 7, 8, 13, 17, 20, and 26 should be withdrawn.

Each of claims 4-6, 9, 14-16, and 21-25 depends directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 3, 7, 8, 13, 17, 20, and 26, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as the corresponding parent claim.

Each of claims 4-6, 9, 14-16, and 21-25 depends directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 3, 7, 8, 13, 17, 20, and 26, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as the corresponding parent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of dependent claims 4-6, 9, 14-16, and 21-25 should be withdrawn.

Patentability of Claims 3-9, 13-18, and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3-9, 13-18, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that a schema does not appear to be properly described within the disclosure. However, Applicants submit that the specification does indeed properly describe a schema throughout the specification. For example, the Summary section states the following at page 3, lines 9-12, that:

The invention includes a schema. The schema defines the acceptable structure for a document, and can also define the valid type and data values that a value can take on. The schema identifies a field that can be used as a key. The key can be identified as a property of a tag including the field, or can be identified by an attribute.

Additionally, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to FIGs. 12A-12D, which show a flowchart of a procedure for defining a schema (e.g., that can be used in conjunction with the data store of FIG. 7). A detailed description of FIGs. 12A-12D may be found in the specification at page 10, line 30, to page 11, line 31. Thus, no further description of a schema as used in the application is necessary.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 3-9, 13-18, and 20-26 should be withdrawn.

Cancellation of Claims 1, 2, 10-12, and 19

Claims 1, 2, 10-12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0068694 of Kaler et al. ("Kaler") in view of *A Generic Load/Extract Utility for Data Transfer Between XML Between Documents and Relational Databases* by Bourret et al. ("Bourret"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. However, Claims 1, 2,

10-12, and 19 are cancelled without prejudice to pursuing any or all of claims 1, 2, 10-12, and 19, in whole or in part, in a divisional or continuation application.

New Claims 65-107

New claims 65-107 are added. No new matter is added. Each of claims 65-107 depends directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 3, 7, 8, 13, 17, 20, and 26, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as the corresponding parent claim.

Claims 65 and 71 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 3. Claims 66 and 72 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 4. Claims 67 and 73 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 5. Claims 68 and 74 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 6. Claim 69 recites features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 8. Claims 70 and 91 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 9.

Claims 75 and 97 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 18. Claims 76, 87, and 103 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 25. Claims 77, 86, and 104 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 21. Claims 78, 89, and 106 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 24. Claims 79, 88, and 105 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 22. Claims 80, 90, and 107 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 23.

Claims 81, 92, and 98 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 13. Claims 82, 93, and 99 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 14. Claims 83, 94, and 100 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 15. Claims 84, 95, and 101 recite features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 16. Claim 96 recites features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 17. Claim 102 recites features that are substantially identical to the features recited in claim 20.


Conclusion

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Justin D. Wagner
Reg. No. 54,519

Customer No. 45842